

The North Carolina Standard

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
WILLIAM W. HOLDEN,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL FRIENDS OF THE STATE, THEIR FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS.

RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA, JULY 12, 1844.

VOLUME X.—NUMBER 27.
TERMS—\$3 PER ANNUM.
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

TERMS.

THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT

THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE.

Those persons who remit by Mail postage paid Five Dollars, will be entitled to a receipt for Six Dollars, or two years' subscription to the Standard—one copy two years, or two copies one year.

For four copies, \$10.00

" ten " 20.00

" twenty " 35.00

The same rate for six months.

(Any person procuring and forwarding five subscribers, with the cash (\$15), will be entitled to the Standard one year free of charge.)

ADVERTISEMENTS, not exceeding fourteen lines, will be inserted one time for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion;—those of greater length, in proportion. *Court Orders and Judicial Advertisements* will be charged twenty-five per cent higher than the above rates. A deduction of \$3.43 per cent, will be made to those who advertise by the year. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out. Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

Saturday, July 12, 1844.

Read what follows!

We give below the opinions of the Whigs, and the character of the Whigs, as given by the Whigs themselves. Read, fellow citizens, and ponder. Can such men as are described below be trusted? Can you trust those Whig leaders in North Carolina who are willing to trust them? Out of their own mouths are the Federal Whigs condemned.

John Quincy Adams's opinion of the modern federal whig party:

"Of that [the Federal Whig] party, TREACHERY is so favorable an institution, that I have heard Mr. Burgess (Hon. Treson Burgess) complain that they have used it even, with him. IT IS THEIR NATURE AND THEIR VOCATION. I welcome the result of your election as a pledge that their chalice is ready to the whigs—they betrayed Mr. Burgess by not sending him to the Senate of the United States. Their own organ in Providence (the Providence Journal) charges the loss of his election to the House upon their treachery. So will it, and so shall it always be—THEY HAVE NO HONEST PRINCIPLE TO KEEP THEM TOGETHER—THEIR ONLY ELEMENT IS A SYMPATHY OF HATED TO EVERY MAN OF PURER PRINCIPLE THAN THEMSELVES." John Q. Adams's letter to Dute J. Pearce, dated September 7, 1838.

John Quincy Adams's opinion of the old federalists, now composing the most respectable portion of the modern whig party:

"A SEPARATION OF THE UNION was openly stimulated in the public prints, and convention of delegates of the New England States, to meet at New Haven, was intended and proposed.

That their (the Federalists') object was, and had been for several years, a DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION, and THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SEPARATE CONFEDERATION, he knew from unequivocal evidence, although not provable in a court of law; and that, in case of a civil war, the aid of Great Britain, to effect that purpose, would be as surely resorted to, as it would be indispensable necessary to the design." Nat. Intelligencer, Oct. 21, 1827. Article authorized by Mr. Adams.

That project, (the dissolution of the Union,) I repeat, had gone to the length of fixing upon a military leader for its execution; and, although the circumstances of the times never admitted of its execution, nor even of its full development, I had yet no doubt, in 1803 and 1806, and have no doubt at this time, that it is the key to all the great movements of these leaders of the FEDERAL PARTY in New England from that time forward, till its final catastrophe in the Boston Convention." Mr. Adams's letter to the Boston Federalists, dated Dec. 30, 1828.

General Harrison's opinion of Henry Clay:

"I will do my duty, even if Mr. Clay is to be benefited by it, from whom I have experienced only UNGENEROUS TREATMENT, IN REQUITAL FOR YEARS OF DEVOTED SERVICE."

General Harrison's letter to Mr. Brent, in the winter of 1841.

"I have done him (Mr. Clay) many favors, but he has returned them all with the BLACKEST INGRATITUDE."

Mr. George E. Badger's opinion of Henry Clay:

"Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, was one of the four candidates for President; but, having the lowest number of electoral votes, was excluded from the House. The State from which he came had instructed her members, in the event which had then happened, to support General Jackson; but, under the influence of Mr. Clay, a man of INTRIGUE, and of eloquence, of UNBOUNDED ambition, and of talents above mediocrity, these members, with those of other western States, voted for Mr. Adams, and his election was the result. Immediately after his elevation, Mr. Adams appointed Mr. Clay Secretary of State, in power and influence the second station of our Government, and generally thought to be an introduction to the first."

"Between these two gentlemen, there had been previously neither confidence nor affection; and Mr. Clay had publicly expressed, in language not to be misunderstood, a disbelief of Mr. Adams's political integrity and patriotism. How, then, are you to account for Mr. Clay's support of Mr. Adams, in opposition to the declared wishes of Kentucky? Mr. Clay, indeed, and his friends, have endeavored to put his choice on the ground of love of country—on his belief of Jackson's entire unfitness for the office. But though Mr. Clay had disapproved in Congress of General Jackson's conduct in the Seminole war, yet, in the very speech in which his disapprobation was expressed, he declared that General Jackson had shed much glory on our country, and that towards him he 'never had, and never could have, any other feelings than those of the most profound respect and the utmost kindness.' When, then, did he desert the man who was the favorite of the nation—the choice, next to himself, of Kentucky—the man for whom he cherished the 'most kindness,' and the most profound respect? in order to give his support to one for whom he felt neither respect nor admiration, whose patriotism he entertained (to say the least) strong suspicion, and against whom the voice of the nation, and especially of the State from which Mr. Clay came, had been distinctly expressed?

"Take the facts, and answer for yourselves—whether it be batch or uncharitable to conclude that he voted for Mr. Adams in the expectation of being Secretary of State—and that this expecta-

tion decided his vote. Let the friends of Mr. Clay thus call off a supply of revenue from that protest against the conclusion with whatever boldness they can press into the service, and the common sense of mankind will still find in his conduct the ground of serious suspicion. They may contend that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We may suppose that there is no proof to cleave him in a court of justice, and subject him to a rigorous punishment. This were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay—it is about the propriety of sentencing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with